DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 359 105 SO 022 875

AUTHOR Churchill, Stacy
TITLE Problems of Evaluation of Education in a Pluralistic Society: A Discussion Paper. Report Studies S.142.
INSTITUTION United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, Paris (France). Div. of Educational Policy and Planning.
REPORT NO ED-90/WS-39
PUB DATE Mar 90
NOTE 34p.; Abstracts of the document in French and in English are included. Paper presented at the UNESCO/IAEA Seminar on Evaluation for Educational Policy and Reforms (Princeton, NJ, March 20-21, 1990).
AVAILABLE FROM EPP/EFD Documentation Centre, UNESCO, Place de Fontenoy, 75700 Paris, France.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cultural Pluralism; Educational Change; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Ethnic Groups; Foreign Countries; *Multicultural Education; *Public Education
IDENTIFIERS *Canada

ABSTRACT

The theme of this paper is how the objective of maintaining ethnocultural pluralism and diversity transforms the criteria for evaluating educational policies and reforms. The discussion is based on analysis of recent Canadian educational experience with respect to linguistic and cultural minorities. During the past 25 years, Canadian education has undergone a transformation that has caused a basic shift in thinking about evaluation related to education of linguistic and cultural minorities. The country has established a system that provides education to English and French speaking populations alike. Ethnocultural groups of immigrant descent and Native peoples have obtained greater school recognition of their languages and cultures. This paper concentrates on issues without attempting to review all that Canadian researchers and educators have said on the topic. The document presents findings of a major cross-national study; they provide a framework for discussing differences in policies for dealing with ethnocultural diversity in school populations. The main body of the paper addresses evaluation, showing how the interweaving of research results, theoretical juggling, and a bit of common sense have begun to give shape to new evaluation practices. Such issues are brought together in a section summarizing new dimensions of concern for those evaluating educational policy in a pluralistic society. (An appendix offers a text extract from "Stages of Policy Development Regarding the Education of Linguistic and Cultural Minorities in the OECD Countries" (Churchill). (Contains 17 references.) (SG)

ED359105

Reports Studies...

S.142

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

PROBLEMS OF EVALUATION OF EDUCATION IN A PLURALISTIC SOCIETY: A DISCUSSION PAPER

Stacy CHURCHILL

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

60 022 675

Division of Educational Policy and Planning

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
F. ZANUTTINI
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Unesco, Paris

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROBLEMS OF EVALUATION OF EDUCATION IN A PLURALISTIC SOCIETY: A DISCUSSION PAPER

Stacy CHURCHILL

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

Presented at the Unesco-IAEA Seminar on Evaluation for Educational Policy and Reforms, Princeton, N.J., 21-22 March 1990.

Contents

Part I

Summary

Résumé

Part II

Stages of policy development: a tool for discussion

The minority education movement

The policy evaluation dilemma

Issues raised by promoting diversity through schooling

New dimensions for evaluation in pluralistic environments

References

Table 1 Major models of problem definition and policy responses

Appendix

Le propos de l'auteur du présent document[1] est de montrer comment le fait de chercher à sauvegarder - au lieu de vouloir les éliminer - la diversité et le pluralisme ethnoculturels modifie les critères d'évaluation des politiques et des réformes éducatives. Il se fonde pour cela sur une analyse de l'expérience canadienne récente en matière d'éducation des minorités linguistiques et culturelles.

Au cours des 25 dernières années, l'enseignement canadien a subi une profonde transformation qui a entraîné une révision radicale du mode d'évaluation des politiques éducatives appliquées aux minorités linguistiques et culturelles. Cette brève période a vu la mise en place à l'échelle du pays d'un système éducatif qui offre un enseignement aux minorités francophones des neuf provinces à majorité anglophone et des deux territoires (Yukon et Territoires du Nord-Ouest)[2] ; tout en maintenant le niveau élevé de l'enseignement déjà offert à la minorité anglophone du Québec.[3] Un effet secondaire de cette évolution est que les groupes ethnoculturels issus de l'immigration ont obtenu que des modifications significatives soient apportées aux programmes scolaires pour y faire une plus large place à leurs langues et à leurs cultures d'origine, tandis que les peuples autochtones du Canada prennent peu à peu le contrôle de leurs propres systèmes éducatifs. A sa façon, ce mouvement constitue l'équivalent canadien du mouvement des droits de l'homme des Etats-Unis en faveur des Américains noirs et représente le défi fondamental devant lequel la diversité place notre système éducatif. Ce qui est intéressant, d'un point de vue comparatif, c'est que certaines des prémisses de la politique éducative canadienne sont diamétralement opposées à celles qu'ont adoptées nos voisins du Sud ainsi que beaucoup d'autres pays.

Le présent document se veut une réflexion sur la manière dont ces changements sont en train de modifier les principes fondamentaux de l'évaluation des politiques et programmes éducatifs. Selon l'esprit de la réunion à laquelle il a été

---

[1]Version révisée de la communication présentée au Séminaire Unesco-IAEA sur l'évaluation des politiques et des réformes de l'éducation, Princeton (N.J.), 21-22 mars 1990.

[2]En 1986, les minorités linguistiques officielles ont été estimées à 680.120 personnes de langue maternelle anglaise résidant au Québec et 942.342 personnes de langue maternelle française résidant hors du Québec. Le Canada comptait au total 25.309.350 habitants dont 5.317.406 de langue maternelle française au Québec. (Dallaire et Lachapelle, 1989 : cet ouvrage contient une étude démographique complète). Comme dans le cas de la plupart des questions linguistiques, ces chiffres sont sujets à diverses controverses techniques.

[3]Voir Churchill et Peat Marwick, 1987 pour une étude complète. Au Québec, la loi réserve l'accès à l'enseignement en langue anglaise aux enfants de Canadiens nés Canadiens ou ayant reçu une éducation en anglais au Canada, à l'exclusion des enfants de Canadiens nés et ayant fait leurs études hors du pays, même s'ils sont de langue maternelle anglaise.

présenté, et qui a été l'occasion d'un dialogue entre chercheurs et spécialistes de l'évaluation des politiques américaines et canadiennes, il se concentre sur les problèmes et ne prétend pas offrir une analyse théorique de tout ce que les chercheurs et les éducateurs canadiens ont dit sur le sujet. Il s'appuie dans une large mesure sur les recherches effectuées par l'auteur, dont les travaux des deux dernières décennies, du moins en partie, ont été liés au mouvement susmentionné. Bien qu'il y soit fait parfois référence à l'expérience des Etats-Unis concernant la question des minorités, le soin d'établir des comparaisons directes a été laissé aux participants au Séminaire.[1]

Pour faciliter la discussion, on se référera à certains résultats d'une importante étude trans-nationale réalisée par l'OCDE qui offrent un cadre utile pour l'examen comparé des différentes politiques adoptées face au problème de la diversité ethnoculturelle des populations scolaires. La section qui suit donne un aperçu succinct des changements qui ont été introduits dans le système éducatif canadien et auxquels il a été fait allusion ci-dessus. Puis l'essentiel du document traite successivement de plusieurs problèmes cruciaux d'évaluation et montre comment les résultats de la recherche, conjugués à la réflexion théorique et à un peu de bon sens, sont en train de donner naissance dans ce domaine à un ensemble de pratiques nouvelles. Tous ces aspects sont ensuite récapitulés dans une brève section qui fait le point des nouvelles préoccupations de ceux à qui il incombe d'évaluer la politique éducative au sein d'une société pluraliste.

---

[1]Voir le résumé des débats publiés séparément par les organisateurs de l'Unesco.

Part I

The theme of this paper[1] is how the objective of maintaining - rather than eliminating - ethnocultural pluralism and diversity, transforms the criteria for evaluating educational policies and reforms. The discussion is based on an analysis of recent Canadian educational experience with respect to linguistic and cultural minorities.

During the past 25 years, Canadian education has undergone a major transformation which has caused a basic shift in thinking about evaluation of policies related to education of linguistic and cultural minorities. In that short period, the country has established a coast-to-coast educational system that provides education to the French-speaking minorities of the nine majority English-speaking provinces and the two territories (Yukon and Northwest Territories)[2]; at the same time, the already high level of educational opportunity for Quebec's English-speaking minority has been maintained.[3] As a side effect of this process, ethnocultural groups of immigrant descent have obtained significant changes to curriculum to provide greater school recognition of their home languages and cultures, and Canada's Native Peoples are also inching towards obtaining control of their own eductional systems. In its own way, this movement is the Canadian equivalent of the U.S. human rights movement for Black Americans, and it constitutes the fundamental challenge presented by diversity to our educational system. The interest for comparative purposes is that some of the educational premises used in Canadian policies are diametrically opposed to those adopted by our neighbors to the south as well as many other countries.

This paper reflects on the way such changes are transforming fundamental tenets used in evaluation of educational policies and programs. In the spirit of the meeting where it was presented, a dialogue between U.S. and Canadian researchers and policy evaluators, the paper concentrates on issues without attempting an

---

1 A revised version of the paper presented at the Unesco-IAEA Seminar on Evaluation for Educational Policy and Reforms, Princeton (N.J.), 21-22 March 1990.

2 In 1986, Canada's official language minorities could be estimated as consisting of 680,120 persons of English mother tongue living in Quebec and 942,342 persons of French mother tongue outside Quebec. Canada's total population was 25,309,350, of whom 5,3 17,406 were of French mother tongue living in Quebec. Dallaire & Lachapelle 1989 , which includes a complete review of demographic issues. As with most matters related to language, these figures are subject to various technical disputes.

3 Churchill with Peat Marwick 1987 for a complete review. Legal provisions in Quebec limit access to English-language education only to the children of Canadians who were born, or educated in English, in Canada, refusing it to children of citizens born and educated outside the country, including those who have English as their mother tongue.

academic review of all that Canadian researchers and educators have said on the topic. It draws considerably upon the author's own research experience, which has been at least partially intertwined with this movement in Canada for the past two decades. In spite of occasional references to the U.S. experience in minority issues, the direct comparative aspects of this topic were left to the discussants at the seminar.[4]

To facilitate the discussion, certain findings of a major cross-national study carried out by the OECD will be presented; they provide a useful framework for discussing in a comparative vein the differences in policies for dealing with ethnocultural diversity in school populations. The next section summarizes briefly the changes in Canadian education referred to above. The main body of the paper then deals successively with several crucial issues in evaluation, showing how the interweaving of research results, theoretical juggling and a bit of common sense have begun to give shape to a new set of evaluation practices. These issues are then brought together in a short section summarizing new dimensions of concern for those evaluating educational policy in a pluralistic society.

Part II

Stages of Policy Development: A tool for discussion

The comparison of educational policies for linguistic and cultural minorities presents many difficult problems, both of a theoretical and practical nature. One recent study, sponsored by the Centre for Educational Research and Innovation, an entity attached to the Secretariat of the OECD (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development), brings together information on how the western industrial countries have adapted their policies to deal with linguistic and cultural minorities. This was part of a larger comparative study of finance, organization and governance of education for special populations. Case studies and papers were commissioned from more than 35 specialists, providing an extremely rich data base for comparative study.[5] Information was available on policies regarding linguistic and cultural minorities in some 16 countries. The synthesis of this study included a typology of policies which is extremely useful for comparative purposes and may facilitate our discussion today.[6]

The typology is summarized in Table 1 and commented on in greater detail in the appendix to this paper. The typology brought together into a single framework all the policies found in the OECD countries by linking them to the definitions used by policy makers in defining their policy problems. Perhaps the most suprising thing about the typology was that it could be constructed at all. There was no expectation within the project that policies could easily be clustered in terms of a common underlying dimension nor that a classification scheme would have any utility as an analytical tool.

The typology assumes that policies are made in response to a perceived need for action, either to maintain the status quo or to change it. Policies are categorized in terms of a problem definition, that is how the policy maker answers the question: "what educational problem posed by linguistic and cultural minorities in the school

---

4 See the summary of proceedings, separately issued by the Unesco organizers.

5 CERI/OECD 1983, particularly Donovan, Fordham & Hancock ibid.

6 Churchill 1986.

population requires us to respond by a specific policy (or by a decision not to change existing policy)?" Six major groupings of answers are found. At the low end of the scale in Table 1, the answer is that children in the target group suffer from inadequate knowledge of the language used in the school because they have a different mother tongue, speak a variant dialect of the school language or come from a non mainstream background; the typical response is to apply remedial measures to teach them the language of the school or to increase their language skills.[7] Each successive stage adds an elaboration on this theme. Up through stage 4 the emphasis is on assimilating the children to the dominant linguistic and cultural model of the school and surrounding majority society. But each stage also provides greater recognition for the home language and culture in terms of school programs. At Stage 4 teaching the mother tongue is even recognized as a basis for developing cognition until such time as mastery of the language of the school permits full transition to the second language. Stages 5 and 6 involve recognition that the ethnolinguistic/ethnocultural group has a right to survive and perpetuate its language and culture indefinitely within a dominant, majority society.

A few points should be made about this typology:

1. Many countries show policy evolution which moves upwards from one stage to the next. But there is no assumption that such movement is necessary. Many countries have stopped at a given stage, including the lowest one, and remained there for extensive periods of time. Although recent history shows few reversals of trend, there is no a priori reason why a shift in policies cannot result in a backward movement down the typology.
2. One cannot assume within a given country or jurisdiction that different "levels" of operation adopt policies or practices at the same stage. One of the key policy issues in the OECD study was how higher levels of government (or governance) influence lower levels to follow their policy leadership -- such as by incentive schemes, constraints, and mandated policies -- and how different structuring of the levels of governance can give different policy results. It would be common to find one stage of policy enunciated at the most senior level [such as a province in Canada], but accompanied by varying degrees of compliance at the next level [such as a school board or division], and a great variety of practices at the school or classroom level. However, within each level or operational unit, one can usually establish an underlying problem rationale which fits easily within the typology.
3. The policies applied to one minority group do not necessarily apply to all groups within the same jurisdiction or operational unit of a system. In Canada, for example, the treatment accorded our so-called "official language minorities" -- francophones and anglophones -- is usually different from what occurs for minorities belonging to other linguistic or ethnic backgrounds.

---

7 For racially and/or distinct minorities who speak the school language, the initial classroom-level response to learning problems is ordinarily to treat them as being a language-related difficulty (if not simply a sign of low verbal or cognitive ability). This response is consistently documented in studies of teacher or administrator behavior. For a recent example in U.S. research see Commins & Miramontes, 1989.

4. To the extent that policies are implemented, the programmatic consequences are logical and derive directly from the problem definition. This characteristic of educational bureaucracies is what gives the typology its utility as an analytical tool. If one knows what the problem definition is, it is usually possible to specify within a relatively narrow range the type of policy and program responses that are found.

The minority education movement

The minority education movement in Canada derives its origin from demographic and political realities. In the mid-1960's opinion leaders reached a consensus that the country was certain to fragment itself if measures were not taken to give French Canadians a greater role in public life and to give the French language a more important status outside Quebec. Many measures were taken in subsequent years at the federal and provincial levels to convert this consensus into policies and laws that would effectively promote the duality of two groups whose languages were adopted as the official languages of Canada.

The educational measures taken were a new departure. In spite of the very serious constitutional problems raised by exclusive provincial jurisdiction in matters of education, the federal government instituted measures which, beginning in 1970-71, provided subsidies to provinces in order to defray part of the costs of providing education in the minority language.[8] Prior to 1967 and, indeed, from the very beginning of the country as a federation, the provinces of New Brunswick and Ontario had provided educational opportunities at the elementary level in French to what amounted to about three-fourths of the francophone population living outside Quebec. Without waiting for federal incentives and on the basis of their own decision-making processes, both provinces acted from 1966-67 onwards to open up opportunities for instruction in French at the secondary level and, in New Brunswick, at the university level. New Brunswick defined its policies at a mature Stage 6 level and became the only officially bilingual province in terms of services to the minority;[9] Ontario used a Stage 5 definition and undertook to shift policies of school boards upwards from Stage 3 or 4 up to Stage 5.

In 1987, when I reviewed for the Government of Canada the results of its policies of promotion of official languages in education across the country, it was clear that a nearly total transformation of the educational landscape had occurred. All provinces, including those where public opinion had traditionally been extremely anti-French, provided some form of education in French at the elementary and secondary levels, and the total enrolments exceeded 150,000. Some had made quite massive improvements, and all had joined into an agreement to introduce into the Constitution a clause guaranteeing to official language minorities (English in Quebec, French elsewhere) the right to elementary and secondary education in their own language, subject to the clause "where numbers

---

8 The entire program of federal involvement and provincial implementation since the inception of the program of official languages in education is reviewed in Churchill with Peat Marwick 1987.

9 Quebec and Manitoba are officially bilingual as regards use of the minority languages in the legislature and provincial legislation; Manitoba's status was not enforced against the English-speaking majority until a ruling by the Supreme Court of Canada in the 1980's.

warrant".[10] In fact the constitutional change guaranteed them education in their own educational establishments, and the clause has recently been interpreted by the Supreme Court of Canada to include the right of the official language minority in each province to control its own schools either by operating its own school boards or by giving exclusive decision making powers to minority trustees on existing school boards. The Supreme Court decision now firmly anchors constitutionally guaranteed educational rights at a Stage 6 level where numbers of the minority group warrant it, but the judgement leaves open the question of what happens to smaller numbers.

The changes affecting the education of official language minorities were accompanied also by measures to promote the teaching of French and English as second languages to members of the provincial majority groups, that is English in Quebec and French elsewhere. This corresponds to the "normal" policy response for Stage 6 and mature Stage 5 problem definitions: the minority language has status as a permanent feature of the national landscape and its learning by majority-group members is promoted as being socially useful. Some aspects of this program have been spectactularly successful, particularly the rapid growth of so-called French-language immersion programs, in which non-francophone children are schooled for a number of years almost exclusively in French (except for introduction of reading in English a year or two after learning to read in French).[11] Finally, beginning in the 1970's, major urban centres with large immigrant populations began introducing programs of so-called "heritage languages": minority children who so wish are encouraged to take courses in the language of their parents and are usually given some cultural background and orientation as well. This occurs usually in after-hours classes but, in some provinces, may also occur during the regular school day. Under a variety of labels relating to multiculturalism and intercultural understanding, most provinces have taken significant steps to ensure that different cultures and their contribution to Canadian history and contemporary society are more adequately represented in school curricula. Parental demands are effectively at a Stage 3 or 4 level in most communities, and most policies are at the Stage 3 level (usually characterized by decisions not to assist in teaching of the mother tongue or to permit it in an environment that is segregated from the mainstream of schooling, e.g. outside regular school hours, use of teachers not part of the main teaching force etc.)

The multiculturalism-heritage languages movement owes its existence in part to the political strength of the relevant minority groups but would probably have been much less developed if there were not available a clearly articulated model of education in the mother tongue for French and English official language minorities. The parallelism with official language minorities has been heightened by the passage in 1988 of a federal law [C-93] which commits the Government of Canada to "preserve and enhance the multicultural heritage of Canadians", [12] even though the legal level of commitment to specific actions is quite minimal compared with the mandatory and highly visible promotion of official languages in federal institutions.

---

10 Churchill with Peat Marwick 1987.

11 A variety of immersion types exist. The most common begins in grade 1, but there are other forms including immersion in later years of elementary school or even high school. The high school option is primarily made available as an extension of such schoooling for students who have already followed immersion in junior high school.

12 The parallelism was deliberate. The law was passed in the same session of Parliament which adopted the first major revisions in twenty years to the Official Languages Act.

The minority education movement in Canada is based on two legal rights which are important for conceptualizing evaluation of policies and programs. The official language minorities have been granted a constitutional right, enforceable through the courts, to:

(a) be different, that is to use their schools to promote their own language and cultural heritage, to resist assimilation and to remain outside so-called 'mainstream' society;[13]

(b) be separate, that is to have schools which only they attend and which only they control.

Whereas minority groups descended from more recent immigrants have essentially advanced claims that move in the direction of only the first right, the official language minority model is being fully imitated, however, in developing education for Native Peoples, though the process of implementing such policies, even for small numbers, is far from smooth. The *de facto* treatment they receive in some jurisdictions is barely at the Stage 1 or 2 level, in spite of empty policy statements and window dressing intended to hide the fact.[14] The Native Peoples have historical arguments and quasi-legal rights which appear likely in the foreseeable future to ensure that their educational rights are guaranteed under the constitution in a way analogous to that of the official language minorities. Implementation and enforcement of these rights will, however, be difficult. Despite the precedence of their settlement in Canada as "First Peoples", the legal foundations of their arguments in education are similar in most essential principles to those presented for the official language minorities.

Most of the progress of the multiculturalism movement has been due to sheer numbers of citizens exercising their voting rights. This power has been marshalled behind the common-sense arguments that as citizens and taxpayers, naturalized Canadians and their descendents should have the same right as any other group of citizens to have their cultures and languages recognized in education. They see no reason why persons of British or French descent should have the monopoly of seeing their culture reflected in school curricula. These claims are also gradually congealing into an articulated philosophy with a basis in constitutional law: the constitution (1) recognizes the importance of preserving and enhancing the multicultural heritage of Canadians and (2) guarantees that every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to the equal protection and benefit of the law without discrimination. Since no group has any prospect of grouping sufficient numbers to pretend to official minority status,[15] the demands advanced are likely to

---

13 The wording of one authoritative decision is far-reaching: "The rights conferred by this section [of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms] with respect to minority language facilities impose a duty on the Legislature to provide for educational facilities which, viewed objectively, can be said to be of or appertain to the lingistic minority in that they can be regarded as part and parcel of the minority's social and cultural fabric. The quality of education to be provided to the minority is to be on a basis of equality with the majority." Decision of the Ontario Court of Appeal, 26 June 1984, Reports of Cases determined in Ontario Courts 47 O.R. (2d), p. 43.

14 cf. Paquette 1986.

15 In some provinces such persons have advanced, however, the idea that they should be recognized as a regional official minority. The groups most in favour of this, the Ukrainians in the West, have been so assimilated in terms of language and culture that the likelihood of this eventuating in other than a symbolic recognition by a provincial government appears extremely small and its practical consequences for education would probably be minor.

remain related to modest changes of the curriculum and the promotion of heritage language instruction for those who are interested. This is particularly the case, because there is no consensus either within or across these groups about the viability or the desirability of long-term ethnolinguistic maintenance.

The policy evaluation dilemma

The implications of these educational rights for evaluation policy and procedure are immense. For Americans, the problem might be visualized as this: what if the civil rights movement of the 1960's had resulted in a constitutional amendment guaranteeing Blacks and Hispanics the right to have equal and separate schools? Suppose that this meant they would be taught mainly in Spanish or in Black English but would receive instruction in standard American English sufficient to prepare them to succeed in economic life? In other words, they would have the right to be segregated but equal, the right to a quality education but one with different goals and contents, aimed at preserving the cultural traditions of the groups while allowing them to take their place in mainstream economic and social life. As this hypothetical example shows, the premises of Canadian educational policy on cultural and linguistic issues are becoming progressively farther removed from practice in the United States, the U.K. and various countries of the 'white' Commonwealth, as well as in most other industrialized western countries. These are the countries which have most contributed to the theory and practice of educational evaluation.

This situation raises the fundamental problem to be addressed in this paper: how does one build a theory-based system of policy/reform evaluation for a society where maintenance of cultural and linguistic diversity is a goal of schooling? The problem is not simple, since most existing practice is based upon differing policy tenets, namely that the goals of public education are:

a. to promote similarity between students, specifically to bring all students "up" to a level compatible with an officially unilingual and dominantly monocultural society.
b. to reduce inequality by bringing students of different groups together in the same schools in order that the "disadvantaged" (i.e. those who are socially, culturally or linguistically different from the mainstream) can benefit from the same environment as the "advantaged" mainstream.

The problem may also be phrased in terms of the stages of policy development outlined in the previous section: evaluation for policies rooted in Stage 5 and Stage 6 problem definitions requires that minority cultures must be viewed positively, whereas in Stages 1 through 4, these cultures are considered an impediment or, at best, a sort of expendable luxury item that can be promoted as a temporary concession to groups who lack the advantages of being members of the dominant mainstream.[16]

In practice, the problem is further complicated by the very by-product of the diversity one is seeking to foster. At least some portions of the population - particularly older persons living rural areas - have belief systems firmly rooted in the idea that the goal of schooling is assimilation and indoctrination of persons from

16 Churchill 1986, cf. chap. 6 "Rationales for policy making".

different ethnocultural groups.[17] To challenge this outlook is to challenge their whole concept of citizenship and patriotism. Persons who have grown up with such an outlook often find it almost impossible to grasp, or even take seriously, viewpoints based upon tenets of cultural pluralism and they may reject out of hand research findings which challenge their "common sense" understanding. It took many years of research, for example, to shake the notion that bilingualism was a disadvantage and harmful to intellectual abilities.[18]

Since policy is not an abstraction pulled out of a theoretical hat by a handful of experts but rather the outcome of processes involving the use of social, economic and political power, evaluation of policies in contested areas cannot expect to be carried on in a detached environment. The evaluator cannot be sure of the winds of political fortune and must be prepared to face storms of protest from those whose politics disagree with the findings. This is nowhere more true than in an environment, such as that in Canada, where policy objectives have shifted within living memory from Stage 1 or 2 definitions to Stage 5 and 6. In ideological terms this is a veritable revolution, where the promoters of unilingualism and monculturalism, have not given up; they battle the implementation of constitutional rights for minorities by using every possible appeal to nationalism and to economic and political self-interest, in an effort to roll back the political concensus implicit in official languages policies.

Issues raised by promoting diversity through schooling

Since no unified set of theories seems to exist which can be cited as an ideal solution to the problems faced by policy makers in Canadian education, I shall try to present my personal viewpoint as a veteran (or survivor) of several large-scale policy-related studies, outlining issues that have proved difficult to cope with and showing some of the theoretical or practical approaches that have proved useful.

Issue 1: Narrow pedagogical or bureaucratic problem definitions. The first problem one encounters in undertaking policy evaluation or policy research is getting enough scope to do a good job for the agency or persons who wish to review their policies. Ministries and school boards are staffed primarily by persons whose advancement to positions of authority has been based upon success in carrying out existing policies; successful innovators often have to disguise new policies or programs as changes that do not rock the boat. There are few rewards for those who systematically challenge existing pratices. A powerful, strong personality that is intent upon shaking up the *status quo* is a rarity which bureaucracies rarely digest without severe gastric pains. For the policy evaluator, this means that most requests for research are couched in highly bureaucratic terms that narrow the focus down to a "manageable" scope. The results are expected to be predictable and fit within a narrow range of options. In my experience, the more detailed is the request for research or evaluation and the more specific the listing of deliverables and expected outcomes, the less likely it is that the results will have any substance useful for modifying policy in a fundamental way.

---

17 Churchill & Smith 1986 for an analysis of a nationwide interview survey (N=4000) on attitudes to bilngual services.

18 Cummins 1987.

If the persons seeking policy evaluation are intent upon controlling the process and the results, there is little that can be done to circumvent this. One can simply decline to submit a bid or opt out of negotiations. On the other hand, some of the worst conceived tenders for research on policy matters are rooted in the best of intentions, but old habits of thought simply get in the way of specifying the objectives or procedures in terms that will get the desired results. If this is the case, even in spite of the difficulties of negotiating through a public tendering process, it is occasionally possible to transform the problem by showing clearly in research proopsals (a) what the tender appears to have as an objective, (b) the limitations of the results to be obtained by following the tender strictly and (c) the results likely to be obtained by pursuing the main objective by means not foreseen by those who sought the research.

An example I once encountered was the case of a provincial ministry of education seeking to review the system it used for subsidizing education for minority francophones, most of which was delivered through school boards controlled by English-speaking trustees. The research had been provoked by the failure of the subsidization system to produce the desired results. Senior policy makers suspected that rather than increasing the program offerings for francophones, the subsidies were being used cleverly by boards to reduce the local mill rates for taxation. In our bid, we pointed out that the request for proposals was mortally flawed on two counts. First it was based upon a conception of added costs of bilingual education that suffered from a whole list of shortcomings --- some of which were the very causes of the weaknesses the policy makers wished to remedy. Secondly the proposed method of reviewing costs was to look at existing school board budget allocations as a means of determining how much it "really" cost to provide bilingual education.

Our response to this was to submit a bid which took direct aim at the assumptions of the tender. With respect to "added costs" of education for francophones, our argument was based in part upon fundamental rights concepts. In a system where both language groups have the legal right to an education, it is patently unfair to base research on the premise that the cost of educating the majority group --- often highly variable in any jurisdiction --- is assumed to be the norm and that the costs of educating the other group are an abnormality, an "added cost". Providing education to two language groups might, under some circumstances, be more expensive than for one. But, if a right exists, then the base cost of that right is not an "added cost", it is a cost. We substituted the idea of "differential costs", which can arise in a variety of circumstances linked to factors such as school size and geography; using multiple methodologies we examined such factors in relationship to the cost of providing education to two linguistically differentiated groups.[19] But our big guns were saved for the idea of looking at costs without reviewing service levels: the tender was based on the implicit and unproven assumption that service levels were roughly equivalent because minority pupils had teachers and classrooms similar to those of the majority.

The resultant research report was a bombshell that hit the front pages and dramatically contributed to altering policies. English-controlled school boards in our sample were collecting extra subsidies for their French pupils but spending

---

19 The main related concepts were subsequently reviewed for the Government of Canada (Secretary of State) in a three-province comparative study of educational finances for minority French education and for promotion of teaching of French as a second langauge: Churchill, Greenfield, Orlikow & Rideout 1979., vol. 1.

systematically more on the anglophone pupils than on the francophones. The boards themselves were unaware of it because of the way their budgets were put together: we pulled apart every penny of their expenditures for three years and reduced all costs to a per-pupil amount on a school-by-school basis. (The only exception was a school board controlled by a francophone majority which had a small English minority; in this case, the board spent more on its minority, the anglophones, than on the francophones --- a curious case of reverse discrimination.) On the other hand, the overexpenditure on the anglophone majority group was occurring even though the service levels provided to the francophones in the majority English boards were grossly deficient in almost every measurable way. In addition we provided the first solid research evidence that bilingual high schools were destroying the educational chances of young francophones by channelling them into dead-end technical courses while at the same time pushing them into forced linguistic assimilation; on the other hand, in wholly-French high schools, the francophones were going into academic streams, succeeding well and going on to post-secondary study in vastly larger numbers.[20] The policy changes adopted following the report included a restructuring of the grant system to link grants for French education to demonstrated differential expenditures, a long-term program for upgrading minority education, a series of research studies (by other researchers) on the main areas of service deficiencies, and a decision to phase out, wherever possible, bilingual high schools and elementary schools in favor of segregated schools. None of these results would have been likely had we accepted the original tender for research.

2. Defining educational services meaningfully. Many evaluations are concerned directly with whether a teaching program is successful in achieving its objectives. The textbooks and research journals are filled with examples of how to answer fundamental questions that take this general form: "Does the program/class/school teach Johnny and Jane to read/do mathematics/understand science?" One of the first problems one encounters in moving to the evaluation of programs in the context of Stage 4, 5 or 6 educational policy goals, is that the textbook examples often turn out to be inapplicable or inappropriate. Or, to be more precise, only if a minority is being educated in a highly developed Stage 6 setting, are the models applicable. This implies that the minority schools are controlled by the minority, run independently in their own language, have trained minority staff members and administrators in control, and use appropriate educational materials and backup resources. Such schools can be evaluated just like majority schools using the "normal" models and assumptions. But if any one of these elements is lacking, this reduces the setting to a low Stage 6 or Stage 5 definition and requires that serious questions be asked about the apppropriateness of "majority" models of evaluation.

The extreme case of the problem may be illustrated by an example. The evaluation of a program might suppose, for instance, that providing a teacher to a classroom of, say, 25 students is an educational service with an associated cost (e.g. human resources, capital costs, materials, overheads etc.). A typical step in

---

20 The evidence on differential transition rates in high schools was not published at the time but communicated orally to officials. The data available made scientific publication dubious even if policy makers were convinced. I later had the opportunity to return to the problem in a much more systematic way and to provide the necessary evidence: Churchill, Frenette & Quazi 1985, vols. 1 & 2.

the evaluation process is to determine what educational outcomes are associated with this service, which then can be compared to alternatives or to the status quo prior to policy changes that resulted in providing the service. This simple logical step can hide major methodological traps.

> ...if the children are from a minority group and do not speak the language of the teacher, it may be that no educational service is being given. In fact, if the teacher is inculcating in them a contempt for their own culture, a sense of personal inadequacy, and a general fright of all things educational --- a disservice is occurring...[Most studies] ignore such fundamental problems because they are applied in environments where the educational disservice can be hidden: The minority language pupils are usually being educated in a larger eductional system which is implicitly based on the value assumptions of the majority language group, including the idea that the goal of the minority is to be like the majority. Providing a teacher in a classroom can then be equated simply with providing a service, and all the rest then falls logically into place. Failure of certain pupils to benefit is simply "inefficiency" in the system.[21]

Coping with this problem requires some means of asserting alternative educational goals that are different from those of the majority system. Evaluation in terms of the majority group's goals shows that this classroom is "inefficient" but hides the fundamental problem of different clienteles with different needs; those needs can include challenging fundamental tenets of the service being offered. One can easily cut the Gordian knot by endorsing minority language education at the outset of a study in such an environment --- but one is not likely to get points for objectivity from those who are opposed to additional rights for minorities. One approach we have used in a number of studies is to postulate that schooling is a public service. From the public service concept flow a number of useful correlates, including the assumption that a service is intended to serve the needs of its specific clients. Such an approach is immediately understandable in our commercial society, and it is eminently easy to apply as the logical basis for setting up a policy evaluation based upon looking at needs of ethnocultural groups as communities --- just as a person selling products or services to a differentiated public may identify different marketing strategies for each.[22]

The public service concept is particularly useful in situations where political feelings run high, because it is apparently neutral and outside the usual framework of debate about language, culture and citizenship. It is easy to show that all clients of the service should be fundamentally equal because they are (except in relatively rare cases of somewhat short duration) citizens and taxpayers in the same jurisdiction. Citizen number 22 has the same rights as citizen number 345 to demand that the local schools serve the needs of his or her children. This equality before the services does not eliminate fundamental ideological differences of opinion about what those needs are and what the final outcomes of schooling should be, but it has proved a useful tool in some of our studies in getting around initial roadblocks to discussing issues in terms of concrete outcomes and in the light of needs of individual children or identifiable sub-groups of children. Above all, it

---

21 Churchill et al. 1978, p. 48.

22 Churchill et al. 1978 for a full description; Churchill, Frenette & Quazi 1985 for an expansion of the concepts to include broader societal aims of minority groups as communities.

provides a basis for looking beyond average scores on normed tests given in the majority language.

3. Separateness as a goal. A fundamental tenet of modern democratic societies is that it is good for citizens to be together and to share experiences. Many countries take this well beyond offering the opportunity for all children to attend public schools; specific measures may be taken to limit rights to operate or attend private schools, or the schools may be forbidden outright. The majority of Canadian citizens, I am rather sure, are deeply suspicious of efforts by any group to break apart and not share in mainstream society. For this reason, serious obstacles have arisen in getting acceptance of the right for our official language minorities to establish schools which only they attend. Such "exclusiveness" generates enormous amounts of ill will and misinformed comment from persons who label as "divisive" desires by official language minorities to have their own separate schools. And, to be honest, many members of the minorities are also doubtful about the benefits of this. After all, they may reason, we have to live in the broader Canadian society so we should learn to get along with our neighbours.

Research and policy studies have begun to open up some new perspectives on this subject, some of which may come as a surprise to those whose experience is limited to studies of minorities in the United States or other countries where policies promote unilingualism and reduction in cultural differences. Some of the issues raised are this:

1. Goal priorities. Members of minority groups have to make individual choices regarding their desire to remain as members of the minority group. In Canada, the maintenance of official language minorities is a major national policy objective acknowledged by all provincial governments. In an environment where most major broadcast media and most daily business are conducted in English, the choice to retain another language and some elements of the associated culture is a difficult one requiring a decision to go against what are seemingly irresistible pressures toward assimilation. Schools operated for the official language minorities in their own language are a sort of bastion, usually the only public institutions where, for a certain part of each day, English is not the domiant medium of communication. Separateness of school accommodation is a choice which can be justified in terms of linguistic and cultural survival. If one accepts the right of the minority to survive, then the right to separateness is usually easy to explain as a corollary.

2. Unilingual common sense versus empirical data. Separate schooling for the official language minority meets considerable opposition from what might be the "common sense" of the man in the street. If a francophone child is going to grow up and get a job in a mainly English society, the common sense says, the best way to do this is to study as much as possible in English in order to be ready for the job market and success. This common sense is contradicted by every piece of empirical evidence we have on official language minorities in Canada, except coffee shop gossip. The logic is based upon a simple and highly erroneous model of how schooling affects language learning. The model is based upon the idea that the more a minority student is exposed to English, the better the student learns it. But it ignores the systemic effects of schooling processes.

Strong empirical evidence shows that schooling of minority francophones in English-dominated environments: (a) depresses academic aspirations, (b) reduces achievement levels, (c) increases likelihood of streaming into non-academic streams, (d) decreases likelihood of going on to post-secondary eduction and (e) increases dropouts.[23] One way of explaining this evidence to the non-initiates (and these sometimes include senior academics raised in the traditions of unilingualism) is to admit that if a 15 year-old francophone goes to an English school, he or she is indeed likely to have many more opportunities to speak with 15 year-old anglophones; however, if the social situation and the difficulties of studying in a second language result in the student's studying in non-academic courses, the chances of dropping out are vastly increased and the likelihood of further education decreased. Which is better off in the English-language job market, a francophone dropout who learned to speak schoolyard English up to the age 16 level, or a francophone who studied in a French high school, completed it and went on to two years of university? [The background fact, which almost everyone in Canada now knows, is that francophones in English-dominated provinces develop excellent English-language skills during their studies in French-language schools, largely because of the many societal opportunities to use English outside school, not to mention the dominant use of English in even school-organized leisure and sport activities.]

3. The myth of bilingual schooling. The creation of better educational opportunities for minority francophones has been seriously impeded in some parts of the country by the insistence of English-dominated school boards on models of so-called bilingual schooling. This involves sending anglophone and francophone students to the same school which, at least in theory, offers instruction to each in their own language but with opportunities to cross over and study in the other language. In practice, the resulting institutions (with a handful of exceptions) operate mainly in English, provide French exposure to a small proportion of the anglophones, and serve primarily to assimilate the francophones. Some of my studies have served to document these effects and, in the case of mixed or bilingual high schools in Ontario, demonstrated that francophones in them have barely half the chance of going on to post-secondary education as equivalent students in wholly French high schools.

4. Confusion about effects of schooling on minority and majority students. Serious theoretical problems remain unresolved in explaining certain phenomena which research studies have unearthed. Summarized in the most stark fashion possible, we find that: (a) Anglophones enrolled in French immersion programs learn French easily and suffer no educational detriments; in fact, after transition back to English schooling in later years, their English skills are often better than those of comparable students who have studied in English only. (b) Minority francophones enrolled in environments which are English suffer from the experience in a variety of ways (cf. above), tend to lose their mother tongue and do not succeed

---

23 The evidence for this is reviewed at length in Churchill, Frenette and Quazi 1985, vol. I.

well in school. (c) Immigrant children have different experiences in English-language schools [relatively few attend French or French immersion schools] depending in large measure upon socio-economic status of their families and their specific national/ethnic grouping. Learning a so-called heritage language in parallel with English does not reduce their English skills and, in general, tends to increase their academic performance in English-medium education. Explanations for differences between anglophone and francophone success when immersed in the second language focus on the concept of "additive" and "subtractive" bilingualism. The anglophones are in a situation of additive bilingualism; they learn French with the clear understanding, supported by all the dominant trends of society, that it is a second language added on to their mother tongue. The francophones are in the opposite situation, where they are pushed by societal pressures into losing their mother tongue. Immigrant children who learn a heritage language and, in the process, have better results in English-medium instruction, conform to a model of learning in which support for the mother tongue attenuates the subtractive bilingualism effects and, in this sense, they conform closely to what has been the model of the Stage 4 problem definition (learning deficit from mother tongue deprivation). [24]

4. Minority control of schooling and participation in governance. The emergence of the right of official language minorities to control their own schooling is a fascinating process that stretches over some two decades. The story of the politics involved is too long to be recounted in detail, but it is important to understand the practical necessities which have served as rationales to push the process along. Policy research has served on more than one occasion to provide some of the rationales used in court cases which pushed the concept forward, but the research really served to confirm what many observers knew already. For example, one small study was based upon data to which I had access as a vice-chairman of a quasi-judicial body set up by the Ontario government to resolve linguistic-related disputes in school boards, the Languages of Instruction Commission of Ontario. A review of proceedings showed a series of cases brought to the Commission over several years in which English-language majorities on school boards persistently and deliberately refused to put into practice provincial policies and laws that guaranteed services to minority francophones: these results were incorporated into a brief by a provincial francophone association and were incorporated into the basic reasoning by which the Ontario Court of Appeal (the highest court in the provincial system) confirmed that the constitutional guarantee of schooling for official language minorities also included the right to control the schools.[25] In a word, the courts perceived that the minority control was

---

24 Canadian research demonstrating consistent positive effects of heritage language instruction in a variety of environments is reviewed by Cummins 1983; hypothesized theoretical explanations of related phenomena are summarized in Cummins 1987.

25 Decision of the Ontario Court of Appeal, 26 June 1984, Reports of Cases determined in Ontario Courts 47 O.R. (2d); "Statement of Fact and Law Submitted by l'Association française des conseils scolaires de l'Ontario", in the Supreme Court of Ontario, Court of Apeal, re: Reference pursuant to the Constitutional Questions Act, R.S.O. 1980, Chapter 86 by Order-in-Council 2154/83, respecting the Education Act, R.S.O. 1980, Chapter 129 and Minority Language Educational Rights.

fundamental as a means to providing access to the instructional services guaranteed in the constitution. Indeed, the right to preservation of culture implies that the right should be implemented and managed by those who are knowledgeable of that culture as participants in it.

Prior to the legal recognition of this minority right to educational governance, political discourse in Canadian provinces raised a fundamental issue in policy evaluation. Attempts by francophones to get provincial intervention aimed at forcing recalcitrant local school authorities to improve the quality of services provided in French were often met by counterarguments based upon the policy goal of promoting local autonomy. Fostering local control of education became a concern of policy makers in several OECD countries in the 1960's and 1970's:[26] one cannot evaluate a policy in terms of its implications for minority control without taking into account related and contradictory goals of promoting local governance.

The specific example provided by recent events in Canada should not cloud the major issue raised by the concept of treating education as a public service and minority-group members as clients of that service. "Control" is a strong term suggesting full autonomy for the minority. But, as noted in the cross-national OECD study of education for linguistic and cultural minorities, many intermediate forms of participation in governance are possible, and these can have significant side-benefits in improving the match between services and client needs.[27] And there is ample evidence that a policy evaluation which reviews minority education without considering the issue of community participation in governance, is overlooking a fundamental dimension by which the clients measure the quality of services they receive.[28]

One significant additional dimension of governance relates to financing of education. In many jurisdictions, local educational authorities have a role in administration of schools including the levying and the allocation of taxes used for support of schools. No review of policy involving devolution of power to local authorities should overlook the implications of different solutions for the equitability of financing provided to the minorities.

A related issue, which is relevant in situations where services are delivered through bilingual school boards, is the determination of what services should be available in the minority language. This has not been fully explored in theory,[29] but some provinces have started the process by specifying through regulation that certain services must be provided in the minority language. Significantly one such "service" is ensuring that minority language teachers are supervised (i.e. evaluated and managed by) persons of their own language group; this is a specific provision of regulations in Ontario, in cases where numbers justify provision only of a few classes rather than a school (which then has a principal who is from the minority group).[30]

---

26 Noah & Sherman 1979.

27 Churchill 1986, chap. 5.

28 Various authors have attempted to incorporate this into a larger theoretical framework involving the concept of "empowerment" of minorities. cf. Cummins 1987.

29 We have provided the only relevant treatment of which we are aware, based on the notion of "expected level of service" in the minority language, based upon the idea of linguistic and cultural congruency in relevant services: Churchill et al. 1978.

30 The range of services provided to minorities across the OECD countries is analysed in Churchill 1986.

5. Judicial review. As a result of modifications to the Canadian constitution in 1982 providing educational rights for members of official language minorities, judicial intervention has become, for the first time in Canadian history, a major factor in defining educational policies and in creating situations where policies must be revised. Canadian experience is now converging in a direction similar to that in the United States, where judicial decisions were fundamental in changing educational opportunities for minority groups. It should be noted now that reviews of existing or proposed policies in Canada now must seriously consider the likelihood of court challenges, which is a quite new criterion of evaluation.

6. Equality of services. Constitutional guarantees for the education of official language minorities have been interpreted by Canadian courts as implying the right to education of "equal quality" to that provided the majority.[31] Jurisprudence on the practical meaning of equal quality or equality is still growing slowly. In a landmark case in Ontario, a judge decided that once a minority was sufficiently numerous to justify having a school, the school facilities had to be up to the level offered to the majority community. In so doing, he rejected arguments by the school board and the Ontario government that the quality of the school would have to be determined within the light of existing policy priorities for capital expenditures. The constitutional guarantees were intended to right an existing wrong (denial of educational opportunity) and have been interpreted judicially as requiring going outside the framework of existing policy to provide missing opportunity.

7. Community development. Educational policies for linguistic and cultural minorities in Canada are now embedded in larger sets of policies aimed at promoting the status of the affected communities --- Native Peoples, official language minorities and, in fact, all ethnocultural communities covered by policies on multiculturalism. This means that reviews of educational policy can no longer be limited solely to consideration of impacts on individual children. Indeed, the reasoning used in court decisions affecting education of official language minorities specifically acknowledge that the aims of those policies are linked to promoting the development of the communities and their culture.[32] Major media response to my own research findings on education is also often linked directly to implications of schooling practices for long-term survival of communities.

8. Symbolism as a dimension of policy evaluation. In carrying out the review of the Program of Official Languages in Education for the Government of Canada, I conducted hearings in all the provinces and the Northwest Territories where citizens and other groups presented their viewpoints. One of the more fascinating observations to be made in this process was the practical importance of policies as symbols. The federal presence in official language education is entirely on sufferance: few things are so sacrosanct in Canada as the exclusive jurisdiction of the provinces over education. For this reason, the stimuli given by the federal government are non-mandatory and the terms are subject to periodic renegotiation: the provinces have a *de facto* veto over how the federal government may be allowed to give them money for education. Despite this fact and despite the absence of direct connections between federal support for the minorities --- all money goes

---

31 cf. note 13 above. Decision of the Ontario Court of Appeal, 26 June 1984, Reports of Cases determined in Ontario Courts 47 O.R. (2d), p. 43.

32 Foucher 1983.

directly to provincial treasuries, and subsidies to school boards, divisions and commissions are given solely from provincial sources --- the federal presence was clearly identifiable as a major factor in political, administrative and even school or classroom pedagogical decisions. The federal commitment was a symbolic form of legitimation which cut to the very bottom of Canadian society and, despite resistance from a few, was often decisive in ensuring initiation and implementation of policies crucial to ensuring minority rights.[33]

In a more general sense, policies affecting minorities must be viewed in their symbolic implications simply because human beings act in response to symbols. If a minority is in a subordinate or disadvantaged status situation, betterment is often as much dependent upon providing a psychological basis for seeking and obtaining support from majority group members as upon enforcement of rights through administrative or legal means. Indeed, providing clear symbols of social approval or disapproval can be crucial in heading off political crisis situations before they occur. At a much more mundane level, hiring of disadvantaged minority group members into jobs with a visible local symbol of authority such as a school can enhance group prestige and promote community development, quite apart from any immediately visible educational benefits to children in the school.

New dimensions for evaluation in pluralistic environments

In conclusion, I feel that it is possible to look over this discussion of issues and see clearly the implications of doing evaluations in a context where policy goals are in the higher ranges of the OECD model of stages of problem definition. The minorities are viewed more in the role of clients of a public service set up to serve their needs. Survival and maintenance of an ethnocultural minority implies that policies will be directed not only to the needs of individuals but to those of the group as a whole. Policy evaluations must take into account the fact that evaluation criteria based upon majority expectations become progressively less relevant the higher one advances in the stages of problem definition. This implies a need to search out, for each type of policy situation, the relevant mix of criteria or indicators of performance. Such indicators appear to be particularly relevant in the following areas:

1. **Outcomes of teaching programs.** This refers specifically to the "usual" range of results of schooling as viewed in terms both of scholastic achievement and of social outcomes outside school (life opportunities, work etc.). It is particularly important to take into account factors other than short-term achievement in specific courses and to include measures of school retention, streaming and similar systemic results of schooling.
2. **Cultural integrity.** The intent of maintaining and transmitting an inherited ethnoculturally-based culture implies that one major dimension of evaluation must be the extent to which the policies result in maintenance of cultural integrity. Indicators can be developed to determine whether the schooling environment reflects various valued aspects of culture (which ones to look at depends, of course, upon what the specific minority group

33 Churchill with Peat Marwick 1987.

values), even if the longer-term effects are usually hard to measure except in retrospect.

3. **Group employment.** Often neglected as a measure of policy impact, it is clear that one of the more valued outcomes of recognition of a minority language and culture by an educational system is that providing requisite services implies necessarily giving jobs to minority group members. This not only has individual benefits for those hired; it can be a symbolic legitimation of the community's status. In addition, there are indications that staff from the community being served are sometimes more effective as teachers than persons of other origins. This is obviously important when the issue is transmission of underlying cultural values and assumptions which resist codification in formally approved syllabi.

4. **Group control and participation in governance.** The mere existence of mechanisms to permit participation in governance can serve as an indicator of policy impact. But serious review is required to determine the effectiveness of any governance mechanism, both as a source of a feeling of empowerment for the minorities and as a basis for effective administration.

5. **Community development.** Educational policies carried out in environments where the school is seen as a means of fostering community survival require to be viewed in the light of implications for community and, in fact, familial coherence and integration. This is particularly crucial when considering the implications of "cultural" innovations: the benefit may not be immediately visible in pedagogical outcomes but may definitely change the way in which the social environment of the school "hangs together".

6. **Legitimation and symbolism.** Improvement of educational opportunities for minority groups is dependent usually upon ensuring cooperation from many persons who are not members of those groups. In an environment where formal sanctions are difficult to apply and the price of political wrangling may be high for the minorities themselves, policies that provide visible symbolic support may be vital in ensuring voluntary policy compliance. In fact, providing a readily accessible means of policy enforcement or giving constitutional status to a right may obviate the necessity in many cases of using other means for promoting policy implementation.

7. **Equal quality of services.** The criterion that a minority should receive services of a quality equal to that of the majority poses difficult problems for evaluation (as well as for policy development and implementation). Equal quality cannot be measured solely by the presence of a teacher in a classroom full of students: Evaluation must include most of the major dimensions of service listed above, including backup services available to the teacher, to the family of the students and to the relevant minority community.

The list is not complete but it suggests some of the major dimensions which must be introduced in order to cope with evaluation of policies and reforms affecting cultural and linguistic minorities.

REFERENCES

CERI/OECD [Centre for Eductional Research and Innovation/Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development]. The Education of Minority Groups. An Enquiry into Problems and Practices of Fifteen Countries. Aldershot (U.K.): Gower, 1983.

CERI/OECD Multicultural Education. Paris: OECD 1987.

Churchill, Stacy & Smith, Anthony. The emerging consensus. Language and Society, No. 18 (Sept. 1986), pp. 5-11. [also in French]

Churchill, Stacy (and nine others). Costs: French Language Instructional Units. An In-Depth Study of Selected School Boards. Toronto: Ministry of Education, Ontario, 1978. [also in French, 1979]

Churchill, Stacy in association with Peat, Marwick and Partners. Evaluation of the Official Languages in Education Program. Final Report. Ottawa: Program Evaluation Directorate, Secretary of State, March 1987. [also available in French].

Churchill, Stacy, Frenette, Normand & Quazi, Saeed. Éducation et besoins des Franco-Ontariens: Le diagnostic d'un système d'éducation. Vol. 1. Problèmes de l'ensemble du système; l'élémentaire et le secondaire. Vol. 2. Le postsecondaire; Technical Report. Toronto: Le Conseil de l'éducation franco-ontarienne (Ministry of Education Ontario), 1985.

Churchill, Stacy, Grenfield, T.B., Orlikow, Lionel & Rideout, T.B. Cost Models of Bilingual Education in Canada. Vol. 1: The world of theory. Vol. 2: The world of practice. Final report to the Secretary of State, Canada. (Contract 470-410). Ottawa: Secretary of State: 1979. [vol. 1 also in French].

Churchill, Stacy. The Education of Linguistic and Cultural Minorities in the OECD Countries. Clevedon (U.K.): Multilingual Matters, 1986.

Cummins, James. Heritage Language Education: A literature review. Toronto: Ministry of Education Ontario, 1983.

Cummins, James. Theory and Policy in Bilingual Education. in: CERI/OECD 1987.

Commins, Nancy L. & Miramontes, Ofelia B. Perceived and Actual Linguistic Competence: A Descriptive Study of Four Low-Achieving Hispanic Bilingual Students. American Educational Research Journal Vol. 26, No. 4 (Winter 1989), 443-472.

Dallaire, Louise A. & Lachapelle, Réjean. Profil démolinguistique - Une synthèse nationale. Rapport au Secrétariat d'État, April 1989 (prepublication version).

Department of the Secretary of State of Canada. Annual Report 1989-90. Official Languages. Annual Report by the Secretary of State on his mandate with respect to official languages. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada 1989.

Donavan, W., Fordham, A. & Hancock, G. An overview of experience in fifteen countries, in: CERI/OECD 1983, pp. 1-60.

Foucher, Pierre. Constitutional Language Rights of Official-Language Minorities in Canada. Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services Canada, 1985.

Noah, Harold J. & Sherman, Joel D. Educational Financing and Policy Goals for Primary Schools. General Report. Paris: CERI/OECD, 1979.

Paquette, Jerry. Aboriginal Self-Government and Education in Canada. Kingston, Ont.: Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queen's University, 1986.

The author: Stacy Churchill is Professor of Education at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education and the School of Graduate Studies, University of Toronto.

Address: Prof. Stacy Churchill, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education/Institut d'études pédagogiques de l'Ontario, 252 Bloor Street West, Toronto, Ontario M5S 1V6, Canada.

TABLE 1 *Major models of problem definition and policy responses*

Model	*Assumptions about Problem Causes*	*Typical Policy Responses*	*Language Outlook*
STAGE 1: Learning deficit	Learning deficit in majority language (L2) due to use of mother tongue (L1). Problem similar to retardation or learning handicap common in special education	Supplementary teaching of L2 Special grouping for initial instruction, rapid transition to instruction in L2	L1 expected to be replaced by L2, rapid transition to L2 for school
STAGE 2: Socially-linked learning deficit	Language deficit as in Stage 1, instruction problem definition same. Causes linked to family status: broad range of problems anticipated, linked to social status, both at school and after school leaving	Teaching programmes similar to Stage 1 model. Special measures to assist adjustment to majority society: "orientation" for immigrants, vocational counselling, youth programmes, etc.	Same as Stage 1
STAGE 3: Learning deficit from cultural/social differences	Language deficit recognized as for Stages 1 and 2. Instructional problem definition same, except greater weight given to affective consequences of culture differences (e.g. concern for students' self-concept). Partial responsibility placed on society, schools for not accepting, responding to, minority culture.	Language component of teaching same as Stages 1 and 2. "Multicultural" teaching programmes: teaching about minority culture for all students, sensitization programmes for teachers, programmes of community contact. Revision of textbooks to eliminate racial, ethnic slurs and stereotyping	Same as Stages 1 and 2 for education and long-term; short-term in-family use of L1 expected, i.e. for one or two generations
STAGE 4: Learning deficit from mother tongue deprivation	Language deficit as for Stages 1, 2 and 3 but a major causal factor is assumed to be (premature) loss of L1 inhibiting learning of L2 for cognitive and affective reasons. Social problems recognized as for Stage 2. Cultural differences recognized as for Stage 3 but usually less emphasis placed on need for cultural acceptance by majority, school programmes	Language component same for L2 teaching as in Stages 1 to 3. Support provided for home language by study of L1 as a subject, sometimes also as a medium of instruction. Sometimes may include "multicultural" component for majority as in Stage 3	Same as Stage 3, except transition to L2 in school expected to take longer in most cases
VARIANT: STAGES 1–4(B) Migratory alienation	Problem definition superimposed on the definition in Stages 1, 2, 3 or 4 regarding problems of contact with, or integration into, majority schools and culture. Children are assumed to lose contact with culture of origin as result of foreign residence and require help to prepare for return to culture of origin	Teaching of majority culture language same as for corresponding stage (1–4 above). Additional instruction in L1 as a subject, often with country's geography and history taught through L1 as medium of instruction. Additional instruction often outside regular school day	Dependent upon residence: return to home language or, if remaining in new country, same as for appropriate stage of country policy (1–4 above)
STAGE 5: Private use language maintenance	Minority language of group threatened by disappearance if not supported, due to smaller numbers of minority. Minority disadvantaged in education by weaker social position of language and culture, due to smaller numbers. Minority has long-term rights to survival. Minority expected to enter majority society outside school	Minority language used as medium of instruction, usually exclusively in earlier years. Majority language required subject of study, at least from late elementary years (10–12 year-old) onward. Transition to majority language usually required for higher levels of educational system	L1 maintained as domestic, private language of group. Outside home, minority uses L2 in work, trade, business life. Long-term group assimilation if demography unfavourable
STAGE 6: Language equality	Languages of minority and majority assumed to have equal rights in society. Language of smaller group may require special support to ensure broad social use: education viewed as only one field of language policy application	Minority language granted status of official language. Separate educational institutions by language, usually under administration by relevant language group. Support measures extend beyond educational system to all phases of official business, sometimes private sector as well	Indefinite, prolonged use of L1 by minority in home and in considerable part of work, business life. Long-term coexistence of minority, majority groups

Note: In the table L1 refers to the first language (mother tongue) of the minority; L2 refers to a second language, the majority language, that the minority learns/acquires.

Reprinted from Churchill 1986, pp.54-56.

Appendix

STAGES OF POLICY DEVELOPMENT REGARDING THE EDUCATION OF LINGUISTIC AND CULTURAL MINORITIES IN THE OECD COUNTRIES

TEXT EXTRACTED FROM Churchill 1986.

Read references to "Figure 1" as "Table 1"

If one excludes the countries with relatively old, established minority situations whose major contours were defined at least fifty or more years ago (Belgium, Finland, Switzerland), the models in Figure 1 represent what appear often to be sequential historical stages of policy development. Although no "new" or non-established minority appears to have progressed beyond the Stage 4 model, some established minorities (such as the Franco-Manitobans in Canada), have moved from Stage 1 or 2 to Stage 5.

The lowest stage (not shown in the Figure) consists simply of ignoring the existence of special educational problems of minorities. Most national educational systems have gone through this stage at some point in the past. The history of literacy policy in some countries studied, particularly with respect to dialects very divergent from the majority standard language, illustrates this tendency well. The development of special education for the handicapped in most of the systems under examination has eliminated most situations where severe disadvantage goes unrecognised at the level of the individual minority student, even if treatment methods may be misadapted.

Since all of the countries in the CERI study have specific policies for dealing with at least a portion of their minorities, all have at least some policies operating at the level of the Stage 1 or 2 models. The initial recognition of the problem in most cases has defined the problem in terms of the learning deficit model of Stage 1, with educational provision characteristic of traditional approaches to special education. By various measures, certain groups of students are observed to suffer from scholastic deficiencies: they have poor grades, make progress through the system more slowly than others, may have special discipline problems, and drop out of school in greater numbers and at earlier ages than the national norms. The Stage 2 model of socially-linked learning deficit, sometimes but not always arrived at concurrently with Stage 1, is recognition of the broader social problems associated with deficient school performance: the students' poor performance in school may derive from the unfavourable socio-economic situation of their parents and may lead them to fall into the same situation, characterised by a lower likelihood of making a smooth transition to the adult

work world and greater proneness to serious social problems in later life, linked to low socio-economic status and poor educational achievement.

These two stages appear to be universal to OECD countries with the possible exception of two: Finland, where the Swedish-speaking minority was originally perceived by the majority as having a position of higher prestige and social attainment, and Switzerland, where the relationship between the language groups in modern times was coloured by the fact that each of the three major languages (French, German, Italian) was spoken in nearby, culturally prestigious countries, a factor tending to attenuate the superior/inferior status relationships often found in multilingual settings. By contrast it is evident in data from Canada (FOG national study -- Canada) that the same initial (learning deficit) conceptualisation was applied to minority Francophones, whose scholastic achievement was below that of their English-speaking counterparts.

The Stage 1 problem definition, expressed in terms of a deficit model of special education corresponds to the adoption of pedagogic measures aimed at narrowing the achievement gap. Where minority students are enrolled in the majority-language system (true of most countries except those with long-established minorities), the problem has historically been seen as a language deficit, i.e. the students have an inadequate grasp of the majority language. The French and German national studies detail a variety of special measures aimed at upgrading knowledge of the second language; educational authorities in England also appear to stress development of English skills for "immigrant" students. The intent is primarily to bring the students' knowledge of the classroom language up to a level where they can benefit from instruction; this is accompanied by measures of cultural familiarisation in some cases, as indicated in the Danish regulations: "The purpose of Danish language teaching is for pupils to acquire proficiency in the Danish language, and to familiarise them with conditions prevailing in Denmark" (FOG survey for Denmark). The United States Title VII legislation for bilingual/bicultural education makes language deficiency the criterion of admission to such programmes (FOG national survey). The United States programmes also include measures that illustrate the type of action that is characteristic of the Stage 2 model, such as programmes to facilitate job training and placement on the labour market for members of minorities. The Swedish survey reports the largest range of such measures, including summer programmes for immigrants and short vocational programmes for all interested young people.

Even though at this stage the primary problem identified is the students' lack of knowledge of the second (majority) language, several countries have introduced instruction in the children's mother tongue for reasons not directly related to the assumptions of the model. The most common case, illustrated by France and Germany, involves the use of language teachers from the home countries of the students (or of their parents) to teach the language as a subject and, at least in Bavaria, to use it as a medium of instruction for other school subjects; this reflects the "external" impetus referred to earlier, the objective being to facilitate eventual return to the parents' home country. The case study for England and Wales cites a report from research in the early 1970s, in which "the authors discovered that although no official policy had been declared, the first limited steps were being taken to provide tuition" in the mother tongue.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Until relatively recently, many educators felt that continued use of the mother tongue by students might interfere with the acquisition of the second language. Paradoxically, the contradiction between the first and second language support measures may not exist, according to mounting research evidence. Nevertheless, the common-sense belief in the contradiction between the support of the mother tongue and the assumption of the Stage 1 and 2 models, has more influence on public opinion than do research findings.

The Stage 3 problem conceptualisation has become rapidly more popular under the name of "multicultural education" or "multiculturalism". It assumes that minorities suffer from learning deficits at least in part because of the failure of the majority society -- particularly its educational system -- to recognise, accept and view positively the culture of the minority. In other words, a portion of the blame is shifted to the educational system, and, in neutral terms, one may refer to a "mismatch" between the programmes and institutions, on the one hand, and the minority needs, on the other. It is interesting that the recognition of the culture of children may be endorsed officially without provoking, however, the acceptance of the premise that the language of that culture requires support. Thus, in England the Community Relations Commission carried out various programmes to support multiculturalism between 1968 and 1976; however, as the case study observes, the Commission showed "little or no concern for the maintenance of the mother tongues of ethnic minorities, and the West Indian dialects are seen only as causing difficulty in learning, a viewpoint which has been challenged by many sociolinguistic scholars". The essence of the model is the recognition of a right to be different and be respected for it, not necessarily to use a different language. The multiculturalism concept appears to be gaining ground in a number of Western European countries, usually with at least limited recognition of the utility of mother tongue instruction.

The Stage 4 problem definition assumes that a major cause of learning deficits among linguistic minorities may be traced to linguistic deprivation, i.e. failure to develop the mother tongue of children. As mentioned above, research evidence appears to be lending support to this thesis, which is integral to educational programme definitions in a number of countries. The United States legislation, for example, defines bilingual education as a programme designed for children with limited English language skills in which there is "instruction ... in English and, to the extent necessary to allow a child to achieve competence in the English language, the native language of the children of limited English proficiency" (cited by Leibowitz, 1980, p. 27). Countries such as Sweden have adopted far-reaching programmes of home language support, where the goal of transition to the majority tongue is complemented, in terms of the policy statements, by more long-term objectives. A Bill passed by the Riksdag in 1975 set down guidelines for immigrant and minority group policy with the triple aims of equality, freedom of choice, and partnership. The freedom of choice aim means that the "members of linguistic minorities must be able to choose the extent to which they will assume Swedish cultural identity and the extent to which they will retain their cultural and linguistic identity" (national survey -- Sweden). Such an objective implies possibilities of long-term language maintenance, this exceeding the minimum requirements, so to speak, for Stage 4. The Stage 4 model is still based largely on the concept of linguistic deficit but is enlarged to accept the need for support of the minority language at least as a transitional measure.

An examination of policies in countries having established minorities permits the identification of at least two additional stages. Stage 5 reflects the type of thinking explicitly written into the Swedish legislation just discussed. It recognises minority groups as being permanently weaker members of society, because of smaller numbers, but recognises their right to maintain and develop their own languages and cultures in private life. This means that the minority languages are expected to be maintained for use mainly in the family, religion, and private social activities. Support for this role comes mainly from the use of the minority language as a medium of instruction in the educational system, particularly in the initial years of instruction. Most minority language students are expected to pursue studies in the majority language, if they go on to higher levels of education beyond some point (variable by jurisdiction). The case studies of Manitoba, New Brunswick and Ontario illustrate situations where, over the years, the age of transition to studying through the medium of the majority language has been gradually shifted upwards. The most rudimentary form of this involves initial literacy instruction in the first years of elementary school using the mother tongue, sometimes combined immediately with use of, and instruction in, the majority language (Churchill, in CERI, 1983). Such programmes are found today in education for indigenous peoples such as the Lapps/Sami and Maori; it is also the case of the Danish minority in Schleswig-Holstein (albeit in private schools) or the Francophones of the Valley of Aosta, in Italy. Cases such as the latter are almost indistinguishable, in terms of teaching practices, from some identified with Stage 4; the main difference is the assumption made about the long-term role of the minority group in the country involved.

Stage 6 is the granting of full official language status to the minority language for the purposes of use in public institutions. Where numbers and social dynamism permit, the minority language may also take its place in the broader economic life of the country, a situation only reached in the very old bilingual or multilingual states (Belgium, Finland, Switzerland). The widely publicised constitutional changes in Spain are obviously intended to move towards a situation like this in areas such as Catalonia. The Canadian case study illustrates some of the potential complications and/or flexibility of moving through these last two stages in a federal system: the policy of official bilingualism adopted by the Federal Government applies only to Federal institutions and services, thereby leaving out entirely the field of education, which is under provincial control. Of the three provinces studies, all have given to the French language the status of language of instruction, but only New Brunswick has also adopted it as an official language of the province for all government business.

Figure 1 illustrates these major stages or models of problem definition identified across the CERI project studies, together with the typical policy response associated with each. In order to accommodate all cases, an additional variant on models 1-4, labelled "Model 1-4(b)", is included: it is the result of superimposing on these models the concept of preparing the students to leave their "host" country. It implies that the school system will provide foreign students with a minimum of instruction in their native language (mainly teaching the language as a school subject) along with some cultural and other information about their parents' country of origin. As the case study of England and Wales illustrates, this model may be superimposed even in situations where there is generally little willingness on other grounds to recognise minority languages for instructional purposes. The impetus in the United Kingdom appears to have come from an official commitment

to abide by the Council of Europe Directive of 25 July 1977 that member countries apply a 1976 resolution of the Council; the resolution laid down obligations to provide "more opportunities as appropriate for teaching these (migrant) children their mother tongue and culture, if possible in school and in collaboration with the country of origin" (study for England and Wales, p. 37). It should be obvious, however, that the institution of such measures creates a situation that easily leads to the Stage 4 model, in which home language deprivation is viewed as a major source of educational problems.

The differences between the various stages of the process of problem identification are not always clear-cut. Some of the United States bilingual programmes are of sufficient scope that, even though the official motivation for creating them, as expressed in legislation, corresponds to a Stage 2 or Stage 4 outlook, they are viewed by the recipients in the context of Stage 5, i.e. as tending toward long-term maintenance of group language and culture. A fundamental shift in outlook regarding the minority language separates Stages 5 and 6 from all the earlier ones; Stages 1 to 4 are primarily aimed at treating a handicap. Stages 5 and 6 seek to cultivate a difference which is viewed as a positive asset for the individual and (particularly in Stage 6) for the society as a whole.

ED/EPP's "REPORTS, STUDIES" WORKING SERIES

Unesco's Division of Educational Policy and Planning (ED/EPP) reproduces selected technical papers in the present "Reports, Studies" working series with the aim to disseminate information and ideas on current issues of interest to educational policy-makers, planners, administrators and school architects. Papers are distributed on request to Unesco programme specialists and to interested technical personnel in governmental and private institutions.

Most of the papers in the series were originally prepared for one of the Division's study projects, meetings or conferences, and have been selected because of their topical interest. The opinions expressed in the papers are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views or policies of Unesco. The reader should also bear in mind that many of the papers are working documents, unedited, and are not intended for public distribution. Thus, linguistic deficiencies are evident in some papers, due to the fact that the author has written in a language other than his or her mother tongue.

The series includes two general types of papers: (i) those focusing on the education system or some educational problems in a particular country (numbered C.1, C.2, etc.) and (ii) those treating a subject with a broader or indefinite geographical context (numbered S.1, S.2, etc.). The current list of titles, which contains an index by country and by general subject, may be obtained from the address at the bottom of this page. Comments on the series and on particular papers are most welcome.

SERIE DE DOCUMENTS DE TRAVAIL "RAPPORTS, ETUDES" DE ED/EPP

La Division des politiques et de la planification de l'éducation (ED/EPP) de l'Unesco reproduit certains documents techniques dans la série "Rapports, Etudes" afin de diffuser des informations et des idées relatives aux problèmes courants auxquels doivent faire face les décideurs, les planificateurs et les administrateurs de l'éducation ainsi que les architectes scolaires. Ces documents sont distribués sur demande aux spécialistes de l'Unesco et aux cadres techniques intéressés d'institutions gouvernementales et privées.

La plupart des documents de cette série ont été à l'origine préparés pour des programmes d'études de la division, des réunions ou des conférences et ont été sélectionnés en fonction de l'actualité du sujet traité. Les idées exprimées sont celles des auteurs et ne reflètent pas nécessairement les vues et politiques de l'Unesco. Les lecteurs doivent également tenir compte du fait qu'il s'agit souvent de documents de travail inédits qui ne sont pas destinés au public. De plus, certains auteurs ont rédigé leur document dans une langue qui n'est pas la leur, ce qui explique quelques faiblesses linguistiques.

Cette série se divise en deux catégories de documents : (1) ceux qui ont trait au système éducatif, ou à un aspect particulier de l'éducation dans un pays donné (numérotés C.1, C.2, etc.) et (2) ceux qui traitent d'un sujet dans un contexte géographique plus large ou non défini (numérotés S.1, S.2, etc.). La liste actualisée des titres, qui contient un index par pays et par sujets, peut être obtenue à l'adresse ci-dessous. Tout commentaire éventuel sur cette série et sur chacun des documents serait apprécié.

SERIE DE DOCUMENTOS DE TRABAJO "INFORMES, ESTUDIOS" DE ED/EPP

La División de Políticas y de Planificación de la Educación (ED/EPP) de la Unesco está reproduciendo ciertos documentos técnicos en su serie "Informes, Estudios" con el propósito de difundir informaciones e ideas relativas a los problemas cotidianos con que se encuentran los que toman las decisiones, los planificadores y los administradores de la educación así como los arquitectos escolares. Estos documentos se envían por pedido expreso a los especialistas de la Unesco y a los funcionarios técnicos de las instituciones gubernamentales o privadas.

La mayor parte de los documentos de esta serie han sido preparados para estudios de la División, para reuniones o conferencias y se ha procedido a su selección de acuerdo a la actualidad del tema que se analiza. Las ideas expresadas son las de sus autores y no reflejan necesariamente las opiniones y políticas de la Unesco. Los lectores deben tener asimismo en cuenta que se trata a menudo de documentos de trabajo ineditos que no están destinados a un público especializado. Por otra parte, conviene destacar que algunos autores han redactado sus documentos en una lengua de trabajo que no es frecuentemente la suya, hecho que explica algunas carencias lingüísticas.

Esta serie se divide en dos categorías de documentos : (1) los que se refieren al sistema educativo o a un aspecto específico de la educación en un país determinado (que se numeran C.1, C.2, etc.) y (2) los que tratan un tema en un contexto geográfico más amplio y menos definido (llevan la sigla S.1, S.2, etc.). La lista actualizada de títulos, que contiene un índice por países y por temas, se puede obtener en la dirección que aparece a continuación. Todo comentario que los lectores consideren útil para esta serie o en relación a un documento en particular será áltamente apreciado.

- - - - - - -

EPP/EFD Documentation Centre
UNESCO
Place de Fontenoy
75700 Paris, France

BEST COPY AVAILABLE